

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

3837

his frame of mind is that of the intemperate comment he made, are going to be very pleasantly surprised by the performance of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] if and when he assumes the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor.

I would simply like to make that sympathetic comment.

Mr. POWELL. I appreciate the words of the gentleman from Arizona as well as those of my other colleagues, and wish to assure them that regardless of who they are or where they come from I will always be fair in whatever capacity I act, present or future. In whatever position I may serve I will always treat everyone with the utmost equality and impartiality.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ALL AMERICA CITIES: ALTON, ILL., AND EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, among the 11 cities chosen this year as "All America Cities," 2 of them are in the district I am privileged to represent in this House. They are Alton, Ill., and East St. Louis, Ill., and they have been cited by the National Municipal League and Look magazine as among the handful of communities making extremely vigorous and promising efforts to solve problems that are common to many cities.

Indeed, another neighboring community—Granite City, Ill.—was 1 of the 11 cities honored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine in 1959. Of the 22 cities named in this brief 2-year period, 3 of them are concentrated in progressive and energetic St. Clair and Madison Counties, which comprise the 24th Congressional District of Illinois.

We have farming in our district and a great deal of agriculture in the wonderful Illinois countryland that abuts it. But we are an industrial people, long established on our rivers and railroads, and the cities of America today face very serious problems. Traffic and housing and transportation and parks, the cleansing of the atmosphere and the building of schools—all of these are a challenge of the middle years of the 20th century.

Fortunately in our major cities, we also have people who are deeply committed to doing everything they can on their own initiative to meet our problems.

We have combined free enterprise with urban redevelopment projects. We have sought successfully to maintain good industrial relations and to improve the relationship when that was needed. Our people have voted the bond issues required for sewers and schools and housing. They have developed their own leadership groups and worked out ways to make use of both public and private resources.

I am very proud of these people, whose community betterment programs have given them three cities among only 22

in all this country cited in 1959 and 1960 as among those deserving the title of "All America."

LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, not only as a Member of Congress, 1 of 537 Members of the present "city council" of the District of Columbia, but also as one who, before coming to this body, was connected with municipal government for some 9 years, I have taken a keen interest in the affairs of the District of Columbia. In fact I was one of the first to attach my signature to the discharge petition providing for home rule for the District of Columbia, and I strongly support this legislation. But until this legislation becomes law, each of us in Congress still has a responsibility to do our part to see that the laws of the District are properly and fairly enforced and that activities conducted in the District are in fact conducted in the public interest.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House certain facts regarding the operations of a private parking lot in the District. This is the lot which is part of the area surrounding the Washington Union Station, including the former Presidential entrance. Since May 1957 it has been operated as a private parking lot by Auto Parks, Inc., of Devon, Pa.

Now, the unusual thing I have discovered about this lot is that it does not conform to the rules and regulations set out in paragraph (i) of section 2 of article 28 of the Police Regulations of the District of Columbia which relate to all private parking lots and which provide, quite properly so in my judgment, that no one can operate a private parking lot in the District of Columbia unless, in accepting cars for parking purposes on private property, he sees to it that the owners of these cars are given a claim check or receipt which is distinctively numbered, and which indicates the name of the licensee as well as the street address of the premises where the vehicle is being stored.

I say this is a very proper regulation, Mr. Speaker, because a private parking lot owner is after all being entrusted with the care and protection of private property, and a kind of contract is actually being entered into when an owner places his automobile into the hands of one who undertakes to care for it for a set period of time in return for a fee. Certainly before such a contract can properly be made there must be some general understanding on the part of both parties as to its terms. The procedure spelled out by the current Police Regulations of the District of Columbia is designed to protect the public interest in just this way by making sure

that before a car is left on a private parking lot the owner knows what he is getting into. Without such a regulation in force it would of course be possible for an individual to park his car on what he believed to be public property and might, without his realizing it, become subject to certain charges which he had not understood and had not intended to agree to.

Now this is precisely the situation that exists at the moment at Washington's Union Station and has in fact existed there since the presidential entrance was turned into a private parking lot 2½ years ago. It has been operated, and continues to operate today, in violation of these District Police regulations. Not only is one hard put to know this area is supposed to be a private parking lot, but no ticket or claim check is handed out to alert the driver who leaves his car there.

I discovered this fact by accident some weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, as Members are perhaps already aware, when I left my own car there under the impression that I was leaving it on public property. Disturbed that what appeared to be public property should in fact be being operated as a private lot for profit, I brought the matter to the attention of the District Commissioners and requested that they conduct an investigation to determine whether the lot was in fact being operated in accordance with District law and regulations. As a result of this investigation I have been advised that the lot has, as I have said, been in fact in violation of law since its inception in May of 1957. In fact the District director of licenses told me that not even he himself was aware that the so-called "clockless" meters which are in use on this lot were private meters. He had assumed they were public meters, since no information with regard to the use of these meters was apparently included on the original application for a license.

But even more amazing than that, Mr. Speaker, is that when, as a result of my request, the District Commissioners discovered this long standing violation, they did not order it stopped at once but instead directed the operator of the lot to continue in violation pending an effort on their part to have the regulations altered to make his illegal mode of operation legal after the fact.

Mr. Speaker, I most vigorously protest any such improper and unwarranted procedure. Is this the way the law is always enforced in the District of Columbia? Do we make legal what is illegal in every case, or only in some cases? And if this highly accommodating behavior on the part of our District Commissioners applies only to a select few, then how do they make their choice? Who do you have to know to get this kind of treatment in the District Building? What strings do you have to pull? And what about other folks—parking lot operators or others—who are so unfortunate as to be fined or go to jail when they are found in violation rather than have the law changed to fit their particular preferences?

Both as a Member of Congress and a former city official I am basically op-

posed to any such method of running a city and enforcing the law.

I have, therefore, Mr. Speaker, today introduced legislation to prevent the Commissioners from going ahead with their bland attempt to change the rules in the middle of the game to suit the fancy of a single operator who has chosen to violate the law rather than observe it for 2½ years.

First of all, my bill would incorporate into the basic District law, out of reach of the Commissioners, the present regulations that require a private parking lot operator to hand out a claim check for every car he handles. This, incidentally, would bring the Union Station parking lot into conformity with the airport parking lot.

Secondly, my bill would set a top limit for private parking lot charges per day and per week. I just do not think it is proper to charge a half-hourly rate around the clock. I think the law of diminishing returns should apply to parking just as it applies to so many other things. My bill would fix the maximum daily charge at \$2, the maximum weekly charge at \$6.

May I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying this: Many Members have been solicitous enough to ask me in the past few days whether I was going to pay that \$11.20 parking fee. Some have been even generous enough to suggest passing the hat to help me out. To all of these Members may I say that while I believe I have demonstrated that since the operation was illegal the charge was improper, nevertheless I also believe most strongly that no Member of Congress should fight for legislation of direct benefit to himself. Therefore, in order to be free to press for the adoption of this bill in the interests of the people of the District who use Union Station, I am happy to inform the House that I have paid the \$11.20—even though it hurt.

Mr. Speaker, private parking lots do, of course, provide a useful public service. But my own experience has convinced me that any municipality must be especially alert to make sure that in protecting the interests of our private lot owners we do not make access to our streets so burdensome that traffic stays away from our metropolitan areas. I feel sure that my bill, to establish a rule of reason in parking lot operations, will not only protect the public interest but also the interests of the District as a modern, American city—the most beautiful perhaps in all the world.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON. I should be very happy to contribute to the payment of the gentleman's fine. I join in the support of his bill. If he would like me to do so, I would consider starting a Stratton fund of about 10 cents a Member. I think we can get sufficient Members to pay this onerous fine.

Mr. STRATTON. I am deeply grateful to my friend from California who serves so ably on the Committee on Armed Services of which I am a very junior member. But since this is the

first part of the month I have the wherewithal to meet the illegal charge. It is not, of course, a fine. If it develops that the Member from New York does not have the necessary funds to buy lunches toward the end of the month, he might then prevail on the gentleman's generosity, but I do not think it is needed at this particular time. I appreciate the gentleman's support of the legislation and I am sure with substantial support from his side of the aisle there is no question but what the bill will go through quickly.

INFLATION IS A DEADLY MENACE TO ALL SEGMENTS OF AMERICAN LIFE

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks, and that they be included in the Appendix.)

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's Record.]

RECOGNITION BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF ORGANIZATIONS OF FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES

(Mr. WILSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to grant recognition by the Federal Government to organizations of Federal civil service and postal employees.

It has been my feeling for many years that the Federal Government could improve its employee relations by acknowledging the existence of bona fide employee groups and allowing them to officially register their suggestions and ideas for improved employee practices.

Somewhat similar legislation has been introduced in the past, but my version of this legislation is milder than previous approaches and should not be objected to as have previous ideas along this line.

My legislation, of course, does not give employees the right to strike or to engage in boycotting activities against the Government. It does recognize the facts of life in the current Federal employee picture. It recognizes that Federal employees for their own mutual benefit be joined together in legitimate groups to present their problems to their bosses and supervisors.

It seems obvious and logical that the Government should officially give Federal employees' unions this right. In many instances such groups are given such an opportunity by understanding Department heads. In many instances, the grievances are settled without the need of employee groups lobbying their Members of Congress for statutory changes to correct their problems, many of which can be solved administratively.

In my own district, I have had several examples during my service as a Congressman that tend to make legis-

lation of this type seem logical and important, from my point of view. One example has been in the case of a postmaster in my district who replaced a postmaster who had in many instances refused to listen to complaints of elected representatives of various postal workers in his jurisdiction.

The employees' morale and the efficiency of the post office suffered because such postal workers had no real opportunity to talk about their complaints to the boss.

The new postmaster, who luckily has had much experience in managing personnel, has greatly improved the morale and efficiency of the post office by meeting regularly with the elected representatives of the employee groups within the post office and endeavoring to improve working conditions and other objectionable practices revealed to him by the employee representatives.

It seems to me that Federal employees are often put in an untenable situation by not having an officially recognized safety valve through which they can let off their steam. My legislation can provide such a safety valve and, in my opinion, will result in better morale among Federal workers, better production, and increased efficiency up and down the line.

I am hopeful we can get support for this much-needed legislation.

DAV SERVICES IN NEW MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of New Mexico citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly or indirectly.

The Disabled American Veterans, a congressionally chartered veterans' organization has a State Department and 26 local chapters in the State of New Mexico. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it during time of war. I have been a member of the DAV since 1950.

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. The present national commander is William H. Fribbley, of Crestline, Kans. The national headquarters are at Cincinnati, Ohio. The national service headquarters of the DAV are located at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veterans' organizations. Neverthe-